Geoforum 97 (2018) 35–45

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Geoforum

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/geoforum

Advancing adaptation or producing precarity? The role of rural-urban migration and translocal embeddedness in navigating household resilience in Thailand

Luise Porst[a,*], Patrick Sakdapolrak[b]

[a] Department of Geography, University of Bonn, Germany
[b] Department of Geography and Regional Science, University of Vienna, Austria

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Labor migration
Precarity
Adaptation to climate change
Resilience
Rural-urban migration
Thailand

ABSTRACT

Currently two strands of research on migration are producing seemingly conflicting narratives on migration and its impact: one emphasizes potentiality while the other one highlights its link with precarity. Publications addressing the developmental impact of migration and its role for climate-change adaptation often portray migrants as agents of change and highlight the positive potential of migration for resilience. In contrast, research on migration and labour relations indicates the increasingly precarious travel-, working-, and living conditions of migrants – both domestic and international – and the adverse effects on migrants' well-being. Our objective is to understand the interrelatedness of the seemingly disparate empirical evidence, which results from differences in both foci and socio-spatial scales in the analysis of migration and its impacts. To decipher the interlinkages between the two sides of migration and resilience, we propose a translocal approach, which systematically addresses socio-spatial dimensions and the simultaneity of mobility and situatedness of migrants and non-migrants across space. Our results show the interdependence of translocal connections (e.g. remittances), which reproduce migration motives, and the embeddedness of migrants at the place of destination – a process that is socially stratified and thereby articulates the disparate socio-economic wealth levels of migrants' households of origin. We conclude that, both the type of embeddedness and the exposure to precariousness determine the extent to which their sojourn proves to be a risk or an opportunity for the migrants and their household of origin.

1. Introduction

Recent debates on migration have reiterated its great potential to facilitate development at migrants' places of origin.[1] In view of the urgency due to climate change, the potentials of migration have also gained traction in the field of adaptation to climate change (Beardsley and Hugo, 2010; Black et al., 2011; Warner and Afifi, 2014). Within these two debates, migrants are depicted as agents of change whose skills and financial remittances serve as resources to diversify livelihoods and spread risk at their place of origin (see e.g. Faist, 2008; Laczko and Aghazarm, 2009; Foresight report, 2011). At the same time, research on migration and labor relations (Lewis et al., 2014; Schierup and Jørgensen, 2016; Paret and Gleeson, 2016; Strauss and McGrath, 2017) have placed emphasis on the increasing precariousness of living and working conditions of migrants, both international and internal, under the influence of the (neo-)liberalization of economies and the informalization of formal work. Our aim is to elucidate the interrelationship of the seemingly divergent evidence on migration and its impact on social resilience, i.e. the ability of individuals and households to withstand stress, to cope with and adapt to risks, and to benefit from opportunities in order to maintain and increase their well-being. We argue that the seemingly disparate evidence – the potentiality of migration to enhance social resilience on the one hand, and its link to precarity, (over)straining social resilience on the other hand – results from differences in the socio-spatial scales involved in analyzing migration and its impact. To tackle the divergence of ensuing research findings from the two research strands, we propose a translocal approach that takes into account multiple scales and places in examining

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: lporst@uni-bonn.de (L. Porst).

[1] The migration-development nexus has been discussed for several decades, starting in the early 1970s with the majority of studies focusing on rural-rural and rural-urban migration, e.g. Harris and Todaro (1970), Fields (1975), Lipton (1980), Oberai and Singh (1980), Massey (1988). As the ensuing rich body of literature on the migration-development nexus has been comprehensively reviewed (see e.g. Skeldon, 1997; de Haan, 1999; Nyberg-Sørensen et al., 2002; Page and Plaza, 2006; Clemens et al. 2014), we draw on their findings to integrate our study in this debate.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.10.011
Received 4 April 2018; Received in revised form 9 October 2018; Accepted 11 October 2018
Available online 17 October 2018
0016-7185/ © 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

social resilience.

Translocality refers to the connectedness of mobile and immobile actors across space, linking and reshaping places, transgressing their boundaries, and spanning a social field that encompasses multiple socio-spatial levels (Freitag and Oppen, 2010; Brickell and Datta, 2011; Greiner and Sakdapolrak, 2013; Sterly, 2015). From a translocal perspective, migrants are embedded at both the place of destination and the place of origin at the same time. Therefore the risk and vulnerability context at the place of origin of a migrant has an impact on their everyday life at the place of destination. Likewise, difficulties migrants encounter or opportunities they take advantage of might influence the household of origin. Translocality thus helps to capture the circumstances under which migration can present an opportunity or pose new risks for households. To sort out the convoluted relationship between migration, its potentiality, its links to precarity, and its implications for social resilience, this paper seeks to answer the following questions: What is the link between multiple embeddedness of migrants and their translocal connectedness to their places of origin? How is translocal connectedness influenced by socio-economic conditions in places of origin and destination? What are the implications of different translocal constellations for the resilience of migrants and rural households? The paper is based on multi-sited empirical research, carried out over a period of eleven months in total, between February 2015 and September 2016, in rural areas in North and Northeast Thailand as well as in Bangkok Metropolitan Region (BMR). We thus place emphasis on rural-urban migration in our analysis of the relationship between migration and social resilience.

In the following, we will first provide an overview on the current state of migration research connected to both development/adaptation and labor relations. In the Sections 3 and 4, the conceptual framework and methodology will be explained, before unraveling the translocal dimension of the relationship between migration, social resilience, and precarity in Section 5. Our analysis will show that multi-embeddedness of migrants can either imply additional stability or additional pressure and insecurity, or both at the same time, depending to a considerable degree on the form and intensity of the connection between household and migrant. Altogether, the study illustrates that a translocal perspective, which takes multiple scales into account, helps to assess the potentiality of migration – both potential risks and opportunities – in connection with the social resilience of households.

2. Potentiality and precarity: two faces of migration?

Aside from the recently growing skepticism that predominates in current public and policy debates on migration,[2] over the past two decades, both academia and politics have rediscovered the potentials of migration for development and, more recently, for climate-change adaptation. Scholars fostering this “new enthusiasm” (Faist, 2008) particularly spotlight the role of migration in spreading the livelihood risks of households and strengthening the social, cultural, and economic capital of individuals and households (Massey et al., 1998; Saxenian, 2005; Kusznetsov and Sabel, 2006; Niebuhr, 2010; McLeman and Smit, 2006; Banerjee et al., 2012).[3] Policy makers highlight the potential “triple win” (GCIM, 2005; World Bank, 2007) effect of migration. The promotion of circular migration (Agunias and Newland, 2007) and reduction of the transfer costs of financial remittances from host to home countries have therefore gained traction. The latter has also been stipulated as part of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals adopted in 2015 (UN, 2015). Since remittances far exceed official development assistance (UNDESA, 2017; World Bank, 2016; ADB, 2012), they play a crucial role in the debate and are usually presented as the core positive aspect of migration given their expected immense potential to enhance a household’s living standard (Taylor, 1999; de Haan, 1999; Orozco et al., 2005; Mazzucato et al., 2008), enable investments (Ratha 2003), trigger long-term development processes (Shain, 1999; Kapur, 2001; Rahman, 2009), and ultimately feed into a household’s ability to cope with and adapt to climate change (Adger et al., 2003; Scheffran et al., 2012; Deshingkar, 2012; Warner and Afifi, 2014). Scholars have thus emphasized the favorable effects of migration on the resilience of households, as this is shaped by households’ capacities to deal with risks and make use of opportunities (Scheffran et al., 2012; Adger et al., 2003). Yet, the “new enthusiasm” about the potential of migration notwithstanding, critical scholars highlight the problematic implications of migration and remitting, such as the disparate degrees of vulnerability among individual household members, whether at the place of origin or as a migrating household member (Lindley, 2009; De Haas and Van Rooij, 2010; Kunz, 2011; Sikder and Higgins, 2016).

With the rise and spread of neoliberalism since the 1980s, critical migration research has increasingly engaged in research on precarious working and living conditions of labour migrants – both domestic and international – in the manufacturing and consumer-service sectors (Wills et al., 2009; Strauss and Fudge, 2013; Schierup and Jørgensen, 2016; Platt et al., 2016). Precarious work refers to the multi-dimensional insecurity of work in a neoliberal economy in terms of employment, social protection, and income, as well as skill reproduction and representation.[4] Given this multidimensional insecurity, precarity stretches beyond the workplace, equally relating to housing, social contacts, and family planning, and also affects an individual’s emotional and mental stability (Wong, 2006; Datta et al., 2007; Herod and Lambert, 2016; Lewis et al., 2014). As a result, especially labor migrants’ individual vulnerability is often exacerbated at their places of destination given their exposure to precarious work and their lack of a social support network at the same time, while also facing support obligations to their respective households of origin (Standing, 2011; Rigg et al., 2016). Scholars of labor migration thus concurrently state that labor migrants need resilience in order to endure their precarious working and living conditions and to assert their dignity under these circumstances (Waite et al., 2015; Bork-Hüffer et al., 2016). Moreover, regarding the link between work relations and the exposure to precarity, scholars of social geography and migration studies have taken categories of social difference into account, such as age, gender, and ethnicity, as well as their intersections (Piper, 2008; McDowell, 2008; Calás et al., 2013; Alberti et al., 2013).

This brief sketch of the literature shows that the understanding of migration, its potentiality, its link to precarity, and its implication for social resilience necessarily involve multiple sites and socio-spatial levels. First, in research on development-migration and migration-as-adaptation, attention is usually drawn to the household at the place of origin (often rural areas), which potentially benefits from migration regarding its adaptive capacities, e.g. through a migrant’s contribution to the household income (Piguet, 2010; Black et al., 2011; Warner and Afifi, 2014). However, focusing on the household as analytical unit conceals the resources required at the individual level in order to exploit the potential of migration (Thieme and Siegmann, 2010; Platt

[2] For scientific analyses of this development, see e.g. Altenburg et al. (2017), Bobić and Janković (2017), Chouliaraki et al. (2017), Allen et al. (2018), Crawley and Skleparis (2018).

[3] For a comprehensive review of the different stances on migration in the evolution of the debates on migration-development and migration-adaptation, see Bettini and Gioli (2015).

[4] Standing (2011), Neilson and Rossiter (2005), Peck and Theodore (2010), Kalleberg and Hewison (2013), Arnold and Bongiovi (2013), Siegmann and Schiphorst (2016). Besides the debate on precarity among economists and geographers, concepts of precarity and precarious work have also been elaborated by scholars of sociology (Dörre, 2006; Kraemer and Speidel, 2005) and gender studies (Federici, 2006; Vosko, 2006; Westerheide, 2015). For a comprehensive review of the literature see Waite (2009).

et al., 2016). Additionally, overstressing the household level detracts attention from both national- and global-level structures, especially political and economic ones. One example of this is the contentious shift of responsibility regarding adaptation to climate change from state to household level in debates on migration-development and migration-as-adaptation (Kapur, 2005; Hernandez and Coutin, 2006; Piper, 2009; Bettini et al., 2016). The positive emphasis placed upon the responsibility of households and individuals to build and use self-help capacities in times of stress is, however, based on a market-centered approach to adaptation and resilience – which Rigg and Oven (2015) refer to as "liberal resilience". These authors thereby underscore the important role of economic structures beyond the household and community level in transforming rural livelihoods. As they argue, this includes, for instance, new risks and vulnerabilities for households induced by market integration and neoliberalization – such as market dependency and indebtedness, and the impact of structural inequalities and precariousness. The latter affects households additionally through migration to urban areas, where individual household members might be confronted with precarious off-farm work.

Secondly, as indicated by these critical stances toward migration-induced opportunities, the individual-migrant level, the place of destination, and developments on a global scale need to be taken into account as constituents in the interconnection of migration and the social resilience of households. In contrast to research on the migration-development and migration-adaptation nexuses, these very levels usually define the scope of research on labor migration and labor geography. Here, emphasis is, moreover, placed on the divergence of the two actor levels: the global economy, rather considered to induce precarity, and the (migrant) worker, potentially being exposed to precarity. In less-developed or newly industrialized countries, precarity stresses the position of the individual as participant in the neoliberalized working world (Waite, 2009; Munck, 2013). In this research strand, though, the link to resilience is mostly indirect, namely through references to vulnerability and the restricted agency of workers. Yet, in more explicit uses of resilience, it is referred to as acceptance of or tolerating precarity (Wilson and Ebert, 2013; Waite et al., 2015), as a necessity to withstand precarious conditions (Baey and Yeoh, 2015), and as the ability to absorb the social costs of labor mobility in a globalized economy (Mills, 2003). This notion of resilience also calls to attention the temporal dimension of the migration-precarity nexus, unfolding, for instance, in the link between the willingness to accept precarious conditions and the assumption of their temporal delimitation (Bastia and McGrath, 2011).

3. Linking migration, potentiality, and precarity – A translocal approach

Enhancing our understanding of the relationship of migration and social resilience requires a comprehensive analysis of the impact of migration, its potentiality, and its link to precarity. As the corresponding conceptual framework to pursue this objective, we use translocality. Informed by the practice-oriented notion of translocality (Brickell and Datta, 2011; Greiner and Sakdapolrak, 2013), we focus on everyday practices of migrant households in dealing with risks and building social resilience, at both the place of origin and destination. These practices of migrants and non-migrants connect multiple places, produce translocal spaces, and create a constellation of simultaneous situatedness at multiple places, and across spaces and scales (Brickell and Datta, 2011; Etzold, 2016). Within our translocal approach, we use scale as an analytical aid to structure space, which conceptualizes (socially constructed) inequalities between different socio-spatial entities, e.g. 'rural' and 'urban', 'local' and 'national', based on (imagined) disparate sizes and scopes of spaces and actor levels and the corresponding gradation of these spaces. Hence, social resilience of migrants and migrant households has to be understood as interrelated with multiple spatial and social positionalities of migrants and non-migrants (Anthias, 2002; Manderscheid, 2009; Erel and Ryan, 2018).

To address the multi-spatiality from an individual migrant's perspective, three layers of positionalities are taken into account: First, the embeddedness at home which is expressed by the sustenance of one's connection to the place of origin and one's role within the household while migrating (Ransan-Cooper, 2016; Parsons, 2016). The role within the household of origin is reflected in the motivation of a household member to migrate in order to send money home, as well as in the purposes of remittances and their meanings beyond their utility. Secondly, migrants position themselves at the place of destination which often differs from the place of origin socio-economically (e.g. agricultural dominated rural- versus industrialized urban areas) and socio-culturally, as reflected in lifestyles, consumption patterns, and the values attributed to different types of work, for instance. This positioning at the place of destination takes place in relation to both other migrants and the local population (Mills, 2012). Thirdly, translocal space as a reference system that is produced by transgressing social and spatial boundaries engenders intersections of multiple social and spatial positioning. This includes 'rural' migrants' integration in urban social environments and urban labor markets (e.g. in a global city) and in neoliberalized economic relations.

Besides being embedded multi-spatially, the social practices of migrants and non-migrants in translocal fields are also structured by axes of social inequality, such as gender, class, age, or regional origin (Page and Mercer, 2012; Anthias, 2012a). These markers of difference become part of individuals' experience and perception and moreover influence their positioning in a social field, which includes categorical intersections (e.g. gender and class, gender and age) (Lutz, 2010; Anthias, 2012a). Ensuing social positionalities intersect with the multi-spatial embeddedness of migrants and migrant households, and, moreover, spotlight the social heterogeneity among them, which influences translocal connectedness and embeddedness. For instance, access to and choice of work can depend on education, social contacts, and responsibilities within the household of origin which reflect the influence of class, age, and gender, amongst others, on migrants' jobs at the place of destination. Class-, age-, and gender relations also influence connections between the migrant and the household at home, e.g. remitting money can be meant to fulfill filial obligations or support responsibilities, reflecting social norms and implicated gender and generational relations, amongst others.

Moreover, in the context of translocal embeddedness, social resilience needs to be understood as a process, which requires us to address temporality in the analysis of the relationship between translocality and resilience. As will be shown in the paper, both opportunities and the experience of precariousness can be related to one and the same migration process – over time. For instance, while the working and living conditions of a migrant are precarious at the place of destination and for a certain period of time, these very circumstances can still create opportunities – for the migrant and/or the overall household – possibly taking effect at a different point in time, though. The second dimension of temporality in the relationship between resilience and translocal embeddedness relates to the potential gradual changes in social positionalities of migrants over time (Anthias, 2012b; Erel and Ryan, 2018).

Altogether, this framework enables us to disentangle migration-related circumstances that shape social resilience, i.e. facing risks or insecurities and seizing opportunities according to the resources and capacities on different actor levels, at multiple places simultaneously, and across both spatial- and temporal scalar boundaries.

4. Methods

Based on our research framework, and building on multi-sited ethnography, we applied a "follow-the-people" approach (Marcus, 1995) to collect empirical data for this study. The first author conducted 98 semi-structured in-depth interviews (together with a translator) with current migrants at their places of destination and with migrants'

families at their places of origin. In Thailand – serving as our empirical example – about half of the population lives in rural areas (World Bank, 2014). Due to the integration of smallholders into national and global agricultural production chains, as well as the continuous infrastructural development, and the high prevalence of rural-urban labor migration, rural and urban areas in Thailand are closely interconnected. In the time period 2005–2010, for instance, almost 10% of Thailand's population had migrated – mainly internally (80%; NSO, 2010). And, according to an earlier migration survey, 30% of all internal migrants moved temporarily (Guest et al., 1994; Anglewicz et al., 2005). Levels of mobility are particularly high in predominantly rural areas in Northeast Thailand, where livelihoods are traditionally based on small-scale agriculture, and where remittances tend to considerably contribute to household subsistence (NSO, 2012; Rigg, 2014). However, the liberalization-fueled *in*formalization of the formal economy entails, amongst others, precarious working conditions in the secondary and tertiary sector (Charoenloet, 2002; Campbell, 2013) – which also affects employment and income opportunities, and overall living conditions of rural-urban labor migrants in BMR.

For this study, three sub-districts in rural areas in North (Phitsanulok Province) and Northeast Thailand (Provinces of Udon Thani and Buriram) were chosen as migrants' places of origin and therefore as the starting points for data collection. These sub-districts were selected within the framework of the larger TRANS|RE research project, according to a combination of the following criteria: small-scale agriculture as main livelihood activity of households; impact from changes in weather patterns; and integration into international and domestic migration networks. Most households' livelihoods were based on rainfed cultivation of rice as a food crop and of maize, cassava, or sugarcane as cash crops. Following the most common choice of destination of internal migrants from the selected rural study sites, we chose Bangkok and peri-urban areas in the vicinity of Bangkok as the complementary study site. This included the provinces of Chachoengsao, Chonburi, Nonthaburi, Patumthani, Samutprakarn, Samutsakhon, and Rayong, besides Bangkok City. For one part of the participants in BMR (42), we could examine the translocal connection from two sides, i.e. interviews were conducted both with non-migrating household members at the rural study site and with the migrating household member(s) in BMR. Additionally, migrants from comparable rural areas in N and NE Thailand were interviewed in BMR (27) to represent a more realistic cross-section of the heterogeneous group of rural-urban migrants in BMR. Out of all interview partners, roughly 60% were female and 40% were male. Among the 69 interviewees in BMR, almost half were between 31 and 40 years old, and about one quarter each were in the ages of 20–30 or 41–60, respectively. Interviewees were selected according to the principle of purposive sampling, based on the criteria place of origin, occupation, education, and marital status. The subsequent analytical processing included the software-based structuration of data and thematic coding. Moreover, participatory observation over a period of eleven months which the first author spent in all study sites in total, as well as data collected in focus group discussions during an exploratory pre-study and a household survey conducted in the three rural research sites in the context of the TRANS|RE project provide background information which allows the contextualization of the empirical material presented here.

5. Precarity and translocal connections of rural-urban migrants

In the following, we will explore translocal embeddedness as a social practice, including its impact on both the exposure to precarity at places of destination and on shaping household resilience at the place of origin.

While embeddedness in the household of origin articulates in motivations to migrate and to remit, embeddedness at the place of destination is interconnected with work at the place of destination and the social positioning of a migrant toward both urbanites and other (rural-urban) migrants (Korinek et al., 2005).

5.1. Embeddedness at home reflected in the motivation to migrate and to remit

To begin with, the following typology will help to grasp the great variety of translocal relations shown in our data – albeit respective classifications of migrants presented here may change over time. These categories derive from our analysis of migrants' and non-migrants' everyday practices in terms of which different motivations, aspirations, and obligations they articulate. The typology thus also captures differences in how migrants are embedded within their household of origin and in how migrants position themselves in relation to both their household of origin and the place of destination. In the first type of translocal constellations, which applies to more than half of our interviewees, moving to the city to find work is driven by the *necessity* to earn money regularly, in addition to the usually unstable income from small-scale agricultural production. In this vein, a 45-year old market vendor form Buriram explains her move to BKK as follows:

> "I live here because I can earn more money than in the village. I'm happy in the village but if it doesn't rain, we cannot grow rice. […] By living here, I can earn money and support my daughter and family. So I must choose living here." (24/07/2015)

The first sub-type of this group of migrants encompasses members of households with little land and/or a comparatively high level of debt who consider paid work outside the village absolutely essential, both on a regular basis and also as a response to a major harmful event, such as loss of produce, or illness. This constellation usually results in one or two household members – usually household head and spouse – migrating to financially support the extended family. Since, at home, these migrants would be strongly involved in the household's agricultural activities, they are expected to significantly contribute to the household income while away. In some cases, the household fully relies on their financial remittances as the only regular income source. For the second sub-type, satisfying specific, short-term needs, such as paying children's school fees, or improving the household's living conditions in general, was the main reason to move – temporarily. The following account of a 43-year old woman from Phitsanulok who moved to BKK together with her husband to do wage work on construction sites illustrates this aspect:

> "If I could choose, I wouldn't want to go out at all. […] If my son wasn't studying, I wouldn't have to be here. […] If they don't let me work here now, I don't know how I will be able to support my children. [...] If the payment's good, I'm ok with the work. I only need money." (30/08/2015)

Given the comparatively low wages such migrants earn and the rather insecure working conditions they are confronted with, the respective migrants had no intention to permanently stay in the city but, instead, expressed the necessity to sustain small-scale agriculture as a livelihood activity. In the face of tough working and living conditions in jobs with low or medium educational requirements, agriculture was partially considered the more self-determined activity, and in this sense less insecure, and, in the long run, more fruitful. Moreover, the respective migrants conceived of farming as part of their identity – worth preserving by means of migration.

For a second type of migrants (ca. ¼ of our participants), specifically young rural-urban migrants, working in BMR is a *transition phase*, mostly starting right after completing their school education, which enables them "not to be a burden for the family" (29-year old female office employee from Buriram Province, 20/07/2016) and to "save enough money to start a new life in the village later" (30-year old female factory worker from Udon Thani Province, 05/07/2015) (see also Jampaklay et al., 2007). This, however, is not only a matter of choice but is also driven by limited opportunities to set up one's own

livelihood, e.g. due to the scarcity of land and of job opportunities in the village. Despite the educational focus and low level of involvement of this young generation in agricultural activities, they still have a sense of belonging to their places of origin. The transient sojourn outside the village may last for one or two decades, in some cases. Hence, this phase includes starting a family, often with children being raised by their grandparents in the village and remittances being used to support them as well as the household's agricultural activities, house construction, and, in some cases, to buy additional land to practice agriculture after returning home, or to pass it on to one's children. Besides the non-affordability of childcare in BMR for most labor migrants and the financial necessity of both parents engaging in income generation, leaving children in their grandparents' care in the village was also referred to as an expression of belonging to – at least one parent's – place of origin. As the majority of the migrants interviewed consider the village their home, they like the idea of letting their own children grow up with the same social norms and cultural values and in the same natural environment.

For the third type (roughly one out of ten among our interviewees), the predominant reason to migrate is not necessarily financial hardship. Instead, moving to BMR is driven by curiosity, by the motivation to "explore Bangkok" (55-year old former wage worker and taxi driver in BKK, meanwhile "retired" and returned home, Udon Thani Province, 25/03/2015), "gain more experience" (24-year old female employee and University graduate, from Phitsanulok Province, 31/05/2016) or attain a higher educational qualification. This freedom to explore usually applies to young, unmarried, and more often male, household members. During the process of migration, two main directions emerge: Firstly, similarly to the *transition* type, respective migrants were still motivated to pay respect to their parents by financially supporting them, to retain family ties, and to share ideas to advance livelihood activities in the village, if they intended to lead a village-based life in the future. By contrast, not remaining a household member was another option, which mostly implied no motivation to send remittances, and either planning one's future at the place of destination – e.g. Bangkok, where working and living feels "more like a school than the actual school" (37-year old male factory employee from Roi Et Province, 29/05/2016) – or moving elsewhere, or becoming a member of one's in-law family.

The fourth type shows the starkest contrast to the first type of rural-urban migrants. This type (approx. one out of eight interviewees in our sample) describes members of comparatively wealthy households who both feel obliged to capitalize on their higher education and seek "not to end up working in the field" and "struggle forever" (33-year old female teacher from Buriram, 15/07/2016) but to find a white-collar job instead. According to their filial obligations and own aspirations, enhancing the status of the family and of themselves within the community of origin drives their remittance transfers. This includes, for instance, compensating for their absence as parents by providing their own children with material goods, or supporting the household's agricultural activities. Instead of reflecting their own agricultural ambitions or intentions to return, these remittances often target the perpetuation of the family's field labor tradition, which respective migrants regarded as part of their cultural identity, despite their rather loose connection to it in their everyday lives.

5.2. Navigating the urban labor market: work life in BMR

To further disentangle the circumstances of migration and their implications for household resilience, the following sub-section will spotlight the major component of migrants' everyday lives at the place of destination, namely work. The linkage between work and situating in multiple spaces simultaneously – origin, destination, and translocal space – will be explicated by means of the four most common types of jobs among the rural-urban migrants interviewed for this study. These occupational categories differ in terms of access, working hours, type of location, flexibility of working time, potential earnings, work atmosphere, and reputation – and thus in their effects on the private life both at the place of destination and in relation to the household of origin, including social activities, family life, and future planning, amongst others.

5.2.1. Factory life – "exhausted and under pressure"

A considerable share of rural-urban labor migrants are working in factories in BMR (Clausen, 2002), of which there are thousands – more than 4,000 in the garment sector alone (Jaisat et al., 2014:7). In general, access to factory jobs is easy; employment relations, however, vary according to education and age. Usually workers with a lower educational level than high school have limited access to employment positions (with long-term work agreements) but will be hired as temporary workers or subcontract labor. The latter status entails, for instance, less job security, due to shorter, less enforceable contracts; less social security, e.g. severance pay (Hewison and Tularak, 2013); and limited access to labor unions (Ayudhya, 2010; Charoenloet, 2015). Flexibilizing employment in such ways also creates hierarchy and competition among workers, which partially explains why most factory-worker interviewees described their relations with co-workers as anonymous and distant, or even competitive. Mostly working around 12 h per day, including overtime, and 6 days per week, both employees and subcontract laborers described their lives as structured by their work, i.e. subject to strict time schedules and rules in the factory. Many felt "under control of [their] supervisors" (24-year old female return migrant in Phitsanulok, and former factory worker, 28/05/2015) and under pressure to meet their demands. Last but not least, certain production processes pose severe risks for the workers' health (e.g. due to exposure to carcinogenic substances).

5.2.2. Service sector – "slaves of time"

Similarly to factory workers, interviewees occupied in the lower segments of the service sector described their everyday lives as almost exclusively structured by work, at the expense of any sort of social life, as they usually compensate for their low wages with long working hours and night shifts, and/or a second job. In contrast to factory work, however, work in the service sector was perceived as less regulated regarding working hours and social protection. This concurs with survey data on informal employment in Thailand, indicating a higher informality rate in the service sector than in the manufacturing industry (NSO, 2010). Nonetheless, internal migrants in Thailand still mostly work in the service economy (NSO, 2008), due to lower work requirements (e.g. regarding education and physical condition), especially in the customer-oriented service economy, as compared to the manufacturing and construction sectors.

The majority of interview partners who were employed or hired in higher segments of the service sector likewise expressed that they felt pressure and stress with regard to their work schedule, and often also with regard to their respective superiors. This was mirrored in descriptions of everyday lives in BMR as structured by "the pace of Bangkok" (46-year old male employee from Sisaket Province, 08/06/2016), its hectic atmosphere, and the constant urge to earn more money, e.g. by doing overtime or side jobs. A former temporary worker and freelance writer in Bangkok, for instance, remembers that she "did not seem to have [her] own breath" when working in Bangkok but was under constant work-induced pressure (37 years old, meanwhile returned to her village of origin in Udon Thani Province, 26/03/2015).

5.2.3. Self-employment – "not anybody's subordinate"

In contrast to the enormous pressure, dependence on employers' decisions, and commodification of their labor, which most factory and service workers deplored, self-employed persons among our sample of interviewees, especially small-business owners, described their autonomy as one core aspect of their working life in BMR. Among them, the perception that "it's easy to find money [in Bangkok]" (38-year old

female market vendor from Chaiyaphum Province, 15/05/2016) was more prevalent. Many of them emphasized the potentiality they saw in their own small-scale business, such as street food restaurants, market stalls, or grocery stores, amongst others, in terms of income and future perspectives. For instance, the owner of a food stall in a university canteen articulated the strong anchoring role her own business served, saving herself from being "anybody's subordinate" (40 years old, from Nongkhai Province, 24/05/2016). Her commitment to this kind of "career", as she framed it, also reflects the importance of both independence and daily cash income while leading a life in Bangkok. Furthermore, it indicates her and her husband's willingness to take risks, a willingness that was required to remain independent and still be able to sustain their lives in Bangkok.

5.2.4. Construction sector – "difficult and risky"[5] but "more independent than factory work"[6]

Besides factory work, the construction sector is a common choice of domestic migrants as a source of short-term cash income. Wage differs by specification, training, and experience, and by gender (Le Mare et al., 2015). Work on construction sites used to be a very common seasonal migration strategy of small-holder households from North and Northeast Thailand. As differences in minimum wages by province (highest in BMR) have been removed (2013) and the educational level in today's younger generation has risen (Le Mare et al., 2015), low-skilled temporary work on construction sites is less widespread among young internal migrants. Members of older age groups (35–50 years), however, still tend to work on construction sites, if they engage in labor migration, as "[their] education is low and [they] have to come back during the rice season" (villagers in a focus group discussion in Phitsanulok, 11/05/2015). And as compared to factory work and service jobs, interview partners' descriptions reveal a higher degree of social support and a less anonymous work environment. As recruitment is often facilitated by personal contacts, groups of relatives or village neighbors working on the same construction site are not uncommon. Additionally, workers are often integrated into a network of former coworkers exchanging information on construction sites with good working conditions, such as a satisfying level of overtime, and reliable foreman.

5.3. Socio-spatial embeddedness of rural-urban migrants in BMR

While above sub-sections explore translocal embeddedness as reflected in firstly, relationships to the household of origin and secondly, work situations in BMR, the following reflections will shed light onto the effects of these two dimensions on positioning in BMR. Migrants' work situations are one essential factor that influences both their spatial location in the urban area and their social positioning while living in BMR – variables which interfere with each other and might reinforce each other. In this context, (temporary) rural-urban *labor* migrants in BMR have to be differentiated from those considering themselves to be closer to the urban society given their higher education level, higher level of economic wealth, formal employment, and financial stability. This is, for instance, reflected in their choice of residential location.

5.3.1. Spatial positioning of rural-urban migrants in BMR

Residential proximity to the city of Bangkok, as well as choosing a guarded housing estate, gives an indication of a migrant's social status and household background. Among our interviewees in BMR, these options are affordable for those who originate from socio-economically comparatively wealthy households and thus have access to jobs offering higher pay and more predictable working hours – which often require higher education. In contrast, low-pay and overtime-related time-consuming jobs limit one's choice of living place in BMR. While living at a greater distance from the urban society, our interviewees' living places were mostly located in spatial proximity to other rural-urban migrants and immigrants, i.e. in mixed residential-industrial neighborhoods in peri-urban outskirts. Most interviewed factory workers, for instance, lived in dormitory buildings near the factory or in the same compound. Such proximity between workplace and living place was also observable among non-factory low-level workers, i.e. construction-, service-, and self-employed workers. This spatial separation between peri-urban areas around Bangkok, mainly inhabited by blue-collar, supposedly lower-qualified workers who live under conditions of comparatively greater financial instability, and those middle-income groups of the society living in the city of Bangkok, benefiting from higher education and stable employment, mirrors the social stratification according to education, income, and origin (Jampaklay et al., 2007; Vorng, 2011; Askew, 2002).

5.3.2. Social positioning in relation to "Bangkokians"

Migrant workers' high representation in the low-wage job sector (Amare et al., 2012) – also reflected in our data – indicates the persistence of rural-urban disparities in terms of socio-economic development and living standards (Pholphirul, 2012; Gulette, 2014). Accordingly, a family father from Udon Thani, running a small street food restaurant in a factory neighborhood in BMR summarizes his overall situation as a non-Bangkokian as follows: "[A]s I'm not really educated, coming and living here is fighting." (21/05/2016).

In a similar vein, a 32-year old male factory employee and labor union co-founder from Buriram Province explains the disproportion between privileged "Khon Krungthep" [Bangkokians] and less privileged dwellers in BMR, who originate from rural parts of the country, as follows:

> "[T]hose who come from other provinces [i.e. from the countryside] are poor and have no work to make a living and to support their family at home. While those who are educated would work in offices, those who are uneducated have to work in factories. And, obviously, the salaries are different." (03/06/2016)

Regarding social positioning, jobs in the lower segments of the manufacturing and service industry, especially the factory lives in BMR as our interview partners describe them, involve a positioning of these workers as comparatively cheap easily replaceable labor, doing precarious work within the time schedule of global markets and according to a neoliberal economic regime. This also holds true for low-paid jobs in the service economy, such as shop assistants, waiters, or other customer-oriented services. Low payment, associated with low perceived value of work, create a feeling of inferiority that some rural-urban migrants sense in their everyday lives. This is, moreover, intensified by the stigma of backwardness that seems to stick to the image of "countrysiders" coming to BMR for work, especially from Isan (Northeast) (Mills, 2012; Rigg and Ritchie, 2002). Besides place or area of origin, socio-economic status and lifestyle play a role in being categorized as *ban nok* – a pejorative term referring to people coming from the countryside.

One reaction to the lack of respect workers from rural Thailand feel confronted with is, for instance, to deliberately keep their distance from "Bangkokians" or from people in Bangkok in general, as this young male factory worker from Udon Thani explains:

> "From my experience, I haven't found any reliable colleague since I moved out from the village. Some people might pretend to make friends with us in order to take advantage of us. It is hard to find sincere people in a society where people struggle to earn their livings. I have friends whom I enjoy talking to but they don't gain my trust. They might not care about others much." (24/07/2016)

[5] 54-year old villager in Phitsanulok Province, former construction worker in BMR for several years (27/05/2015).

[6] 33-year old male construction worker from Buriram Province (17/07/2016).

The statement additionally stresses the worker's perceived distance from Bangkok, which most of the interviewees concurred with. For instance, a 43-year-old employee from Khon Kaen who has lived in Bangkok for 22 years, remarked: "I feel at home here; but still, I'm not a Bangkokian" (family father living with his wife, also from Northeast Thailand, and their daughter in BKK, 08/06/2016). This lack of place attachment was reflected in the common framing of BMR as only a work place, i.e. a place to make money before returning home again. Hence, besides the length of stay, the sense of identification with "urban lifestyles" and affiliation with BMR influence one's social positioning in BMR (see also Gulette, 2014:1260).

One feature of an "urban lifestyle", which several interview partners mentioned, is individualization. Besides loneliness due to the physical distance from one's family, feelings of social and emotional distance or strangeness were mostly associated with the individualized lifestyle in BMR. The following statement by a former factory worker in Bangkok, originating from Phitsanulok Province, shows the extent to which her sojourn in Bangkok was strained by the individualized lifestyle with which she did not feel comfortable:

> "I learnt that by living there [in Bangkok], I could get into depression. Here [in the village] it is more lively and joyous. The quality of life here is better compared to outside because all my neighbors are trustworthy and always helping each other, even though we are not related by blood. In the city, every man is for himself. I couldn't trust anyone. […] it is more about you yourself and there is no sense of community like here. […] it is not livable for me." (60-year old woman, used to engage in seasonal labor migration to support her two sons by herself, after her divorce, 12/05/2015)

Another important dimension of migrants' embedding at the place of destination is articulated in their positioning in relation to other rural-urban migrants, which we will turn to now.

5.3.3. Social positioning in relation to other rural-urban migrants

Trust and social contacts in BMR are based on commonalities in origin, in socio-economic background, and in everyday life experience as a rural-urban migrant in BMR (Didero, 2011). This is partially a consequence of the social marginalization based on internalized class identities and reflected in the term *ban nok*, for instance (see also Mills, 1999). Furthermore, similar experience, such as emotional distress, loneliness, and financial burdens, create a sense of belonging and mutual understanding. Remittances are one dimension of the experience most rural-urban migrants share. Another common experience is that of separation from one's own children while working in BMR, due to both financial constraints and socio-cultural considerations, i.e. one's sense of belonging to the place of origin that evokes the intention to expose one's own children to the same socio-cultural background.

In many cases, relatives and partners are the most important social contacts and support network in BMR. One reason for this is the construction of belongingness that is rooted in a sense of region-based cultural specialness regarding mentality and social behavior (see also Jampaklay et al., 2007:488), as the following statement by a 29-year-old (male) factory worker from Udon Thani indicates:

> "Isan people cling to the belief that family members, relatives and people from the same village are more important and reliable than people from other areas. So, they might not be open to or trust others." (24/07/2016)

At the same time, financial constraints and long working hours confine investments in social life. Here, we have to distinguish between rural-urban migrants who, predominantly, move out of necessity and for a limited period of time to labor in low- or medium-skilled jobs, and those with access to more prestigious white-collar jobs, envisioning long(er)-term stays in BMR. Parsons (2016, 2017), for instance, examining rural-urban migration in Cambodia, finds that migrants from wealthier households, depending less on remittances, enjoy greater freedoms in terms of expenses at the place of destination, including their participation in social activities. He therefore sees the rural structural inequality as being reproduced in urban areas (Parsons, 2016:13). This also applies to rural-urban migration in Thailand, as our data indicate. For instance, factory or low-level service workers whose remittances were an important asset in the household's budget repeatedly mentioned restrictions they placed on their everyday consumption or on social activities in order to minimize expenses and secure regular and sufficient remittances. The case of a 47-year-old security guard from Buriram Province, stating "everything's on my shoulders; I'm the only one sending money" (30/06/2016), precisely illustrates this situation. The amount of his monthly remittances depends on the support needs of his mother and sister residing in the village. He tries to balance higher demands by cutting his own everyday expenses or taking groceries on credit. The combination of factors resulting in the precarious conditions that shape his everyday life in BMR include his unspecific job expertise and comparatively older age, which restrict his access to jobs; his filial support obligation as unmarried son in his parental household; and his household's socio-economically weak condition and thus vulnerability to climate-related risks, such as the latest dry spell (late 2015) in that area. Despite his continual remittance transfers, the household's dependence on his remittances seems to persist, which, for him, aggravates the complications already induced by his precarious work conditions. Several interviewees, in contrast, holding higher educational degrees and accordingly working in higher segments of the service sector or in education or health, and originating from households that do not depend on remittances, assigned lower priority to remittance transfers than to expenses related to their own everyday lives in BMR and to their own savings. Besides establishing closer relationships at the place of residence, these somewhat more privileged rural-urban migrants also approximate an "urban lifestyle". The ensuing stronger anchor at the place of residence corresponds with the widespread intention among them to stay in BMR for longer periods. In contrast, refraining from social life at the place of residence – mostly applying to the type of migrant described before – is often accompanied by a more pronounced sense of belonging to both the place and the household of origin.

6. Reconciling migrant everyday life experience and household responsibilities: Precarity and translocal embeddedness

As shown in the previous sections, migrants' differential resources and abilities to position themselves within the urban society are influenced by translocal embeddedness. In this respect, the links between the capital endowment of households and ensuing motivations to migrate and send remittances – out of necessity, as a transition phase, or based on choice – and the type of work migrants have access to suggest a path dependency of translocal embeddedness. At the same time, scale helps to refine the understanding of this very outcome of translocal embeddedness. That is to say, insofar as migrants' and non-migrants' practices transgress spatial boundaries, migration impact also spans multiple actor levels, spaces, and timescales. As an illustration, remittance needs by households of origin often intersect with precarious work of migrating household members because the socio-economic situation of the household of origin is partially reflected in the living and working conditions of the migrating household member in the city. However, conditions that tend to be precarious at the place of destination and result in limited abilities to accumulate capital, can still fulfill a valuable function within a given translocal constellation. Therefore, the migration experience and the social resilience of the migrant household are not necessarily equivalent insofar as seeking to stabilize the income situation of the family at home, might entail severe constraints to the individual migrant's everyday life at the place of destination (see also Schade et al., 2016; Parsons, 2017).

The translocal constellation that connects a 42-year-old female garment wage worker in Bangkok with her household of origin is a case

in point. Besides solely carrying the financial responsibility for her two teenage children and one niece living with her, she also took out a high-interest informal loan, borrowed from a co-worker, on behalf of her household in the village in order for them to reduce their enormous debts at the bank and maintain the household's agricultural activities. Lacking sufficient land or other income sources, her household of origin (numbering twelve members in total) depends on her income generation in Bangkok. She therefore does not seem to have any other option than continuing her work in the sewing house trying to make ends meet for both her family in Bangkok and in the village.

In contrast, the circumstances under which a 40-year-old factory employee is translocally embedded in Bangkok and at home (Northeast Thailand) provide the counter example. Originating from a comparatively small household (four members) disposing of sufficient income to more than cover expenses and debt, no remittance expectations were placed on him when he moved to Bangkok after high school. While working to sustain his own life, he obtained a Bachelor degree, which later helped him to improve his status in the factory from a subcontract worker to an employee. The ensuing annual bonus payment enabled him to contribute to his household of origin even without any urgent need. Before starting his own family in Bangkok, he invested that money in building fish ponds in his parents' fields and raising chicken, in addition to growing rice. He also visited the village frequently to help other villagers writing funding proposals and business plans and to coordinate with the district administration office to establish village groups. He considers this kind of supportive intervention that enhanced villagers' capacity to support themselves as the reason for their independence from remittances.

As this example shows, the chances of attaining employee status in factories or service jobs, or work in the high-skilled service sector, are higher for migrants from socio-economically wealthier households, which tend to provide their children with access to higher education, and which do not necessarily rely on remittances for their livelihoods. Moreover, migrants from such households tend to be able to choose a lifestyle that resembles that of their Bangkokian counterparts regarding living place, consumption patterns, and social activities (see also Parsons, 2017). Nonetheless, depending on their connection to their places and households of origin, e.g. through filial obligation, children at home, or agricultural ambitions for those places of origin, these rural-urban migrants also engage in remitting. Their remittances' use and impact might reach a different level (see above example), though, as compared to remittances sent to less-wealthy and more remittance-focused households in which remittances are often needed for everyday consumption or debt repayment.

Deviations from this pattern, in which migrants from disadvantaged households are confronted with precarity, while migrants from comparatively wealthy households have access to higher-valued jobs and can afford a social life in the city, are hardly observable in our data. A few cases, however, suggest a potential interruption of the path dependency through the gradual improvement of a migrant's working and living conditions over time. Consequently, migrants from underprivileged households, in the context of the place of origin, would also gain access to jobs that are less precarious in terms of employment relationship, place of work, working hours, and payment. The 29-year-old daughter of landless farmers in Buriram, for instance, used to work as a shop assistant and domestic worker for about 10 years until she became employed as a sales officer in a small company, facilitated by the social network she had established in the meantime. This change of jobs also involved an upgraded job status for her. Moreover, in some cases, parents, doing wage work as rural-urban migrants, facilitate their children's higher education and thus their access to higher-level jobs, which might imply a gradual change of the household's socio-economic status. This is exemplified by a farm household in Phitsanulok Province whose elder daughter has been engaged in seasonal wage work in BMR since graduating from primary school. In contrast to other villagers in the sub-district, who can usually afford to avoid labor migration after a couple of years, she and her husband still work in Bangkok – as massagers on their own account – using their wage to support their first son's law studies. Obtaining a university degree would be a crucial change of the education level to date in this household (primary school).

In all of the aforementioned examples, gender relations, specifically the division of sex roles, have significant effects. For instance, the older sister of the factory employee was expected to start working on the family's fields instead of obtaining her high-school degree. An opportunity her brother, in contrast, had, which also facilitated his subsequent move to BKK. Similarly, gendered responsibilities are observable in the example of the sales officer from Buriram. While she felt compelled to fulfill her filial obligations by earning money to disburden her parents, her younger brother obtained his high-school degree. This was even supported by her monthly remittances which contributed to greater financial flexibility in their parental household. Meanwhile working in a factory in BMR, the brother barely sends remittances home. Enjoying greater freedom and facing lower expectations as a son depicts a more general pattern in gender relations in Thailand: Although, as compared to other Southeast Asian countries, relations between men and women prove to be more egalitarian in Thailand, with roles of men and women being complementary rather than competitive (Le Mare et al., 2015; Lindberg-Falk, 2010), research has also shown the overall inferior position of women toward men induced by inequalities in terms of responsibilities, moral obligation, filial and conjugal obligations, social functions and identity (Osaki, 1999; De Jong, 2000; Mills, 2003; Vanwey, 2004; Curran et al., 2005). The ensuing disparate room of maneuver also articulates in the exposure to precarity, as the example of the single mother and garment wage worker illustrates. After her former husband had left the family, she is the only one supporting their teenage children, besides her sole responsibility to repay the informal loan she took on behalf of her extended family at home. Apart from that, she had substituted her – more secure – job as an employee in a factory further away from their house to become a wage worker in a nearer factory on her then-husband's request, so she could organize her double role as caretaker and breadwinner. Although her former husband also used to work in that same factory closer to their house, he would not fulfill this double role.

Regardless of the overall rather consistent pattern described above – i.e. embedding at the place of destination reflects household conditions at home –, translocal embeddedness also modifies the value that is allocated to job opportunities and work conditions and to investments in social life in BMR. Identifying such kind of reworking through translocal practice, which affects the impact of migration, also originates in the consideration of multiple spatial scales and actor levels. That is to say, through embedding at multiple places at the same time, these places and levels of spaces are interconnected and are thus being reshaped in terms of their 'logic' (see also Etzold, 2016). Hence, work and lifestyles at the place of destination, for instance, are not only evaluated in the context of the social field there but also with reference to the "rules of the game" at the place of origin. This implies first, that, at the place of destination, a worker, for instance, is evaluated by her/his work, its educational requirements and income prospects. Within a translocal space, however, a migrant's work is also evaluated by its outcome for the household of origin. For instance, the money a former migrant from Udon Thani used to earn as a domestic worker and in low-skilled jobs in factories in BMR enabled her parents to gradually improve the household's living conditions through the extension of their fields, the acquisition of agricultural machines, and the construction of a more stable house. In another case, wages earned in factories were used to buy land in the village of origin and cultivate it with the help of a relative until that migrant's return. Moreover, in many cases, parents worked on construction sites or in low-wage service jobs to support their children's university studies. The value of such work – regarding its reputation and remuneration – might not be high within the social sphere at the place of destination. However, within the translocal

context and at the household level, the very same work contributes to the accumulation of cultural capital, which, in turn, can be converted into economic capital in the education-focused (urban) labor market.

Yet another implication of translocal embeddedness relates to its influence on the ability to deal with precariousness. In as far as translocal embeddedness involves reciprocity, "enduring hardship", as the aforementioned garment worker and single mother from Buriram put it (02/09/2016), is interrelated with the household at home. While the pressure to generate income to reduce risks for the household – extraordinary indebtedness in her case – rather contributes to the migrant's vulnerability, the respective migrant also has access to translocal household-based resources. This partially compensates for insecurities at the place of destination. Such stabilizing resources include a *distance-proof* social support network through the extended family, e.g. for childcare or as a fallback option, and material support, e.g. agricultural produce, and moral and emotional support, i.e. disposing of a place of living and belonging independently from the urban society. Hence, translocal embeddedness involves both stabilizing and destabilizing effects at the same time, for both the migrant and the overall household. The ensuing tension between opportunities and risks accentuates, once again, the importance of taking scale into account when assessing resilience in relation to migration. At the same time, such assessments might vary over time, given the processual nature of both migration and social resilience, which portends the importance of temporality in the migration-resilience link. For instance, imagining "hardship" – experienced as a migrant worker in BKK – as temporary helps "enduring" it (Bastia and McGrath, 2011). That is to say, anticipating one's return home, which will – no matter how soon or far in the future – put an end to these hardships, might contribute to the willingness and ability to face them for the time being. On the household level, temporality also highlights once again the convoluted relationship between migration-related potentiality and precarity, insofar as precarious work and restrictions to private life during a migrant's stay in BKK might pay off in terms of their children's higher education and enhanced future prospects.

7. Conclusion

As shown in this paper, to examine the migration-resilience link, and to shed light onto the seemingly conflicting evidence of the potentiality of migration on the one hand and precarity associated with it on the other, it is essential to understand the impact of the simultaneous embeddedness of migrants at multiple places. Everyday lives at multiple places are interlinked due to migrant-household connectedness across space. As a consequence, social settings are intertwined, as well as spatial levels, and different temporal dimensions of practices and processes. This implies convoluted relationships on both the empirical and the conceptual level. Translocality offers a useful framework to fruitfully integrate multiple analytical dimensions (scale, social practice, temporality), which helped us to capture both the multitude of micro-level practices and influential factors and relations on a more abstract level which are at the same time constantly re-constructed by the ordinary everyday individual activities. As scale as well as intersecting social categories focus on differences, inequalities, and spatial and social boundaries, translocality benefits from incorporating these analytical dimensions, while placing emphasis on links, networks, and interconnectedness, at the same time. Thereby, translocality contributes to an understanding of the practices and implications of transcending spatial and social-categorical boundaries. This paper's main focus was, however, scale as an additional analytical dimension within the translocality framework, whereas both temporality and intersecting axes of difference, such as gender and class, as additional perspectives in interaction with translocal embeddedness will need further elaboration. Addressing these dimensions in the analysis of translocal relations will further advance our understanding of the migration-resilience nexus.

Altogether, we could show how the multifaceted linkages between multiple places and social settings and different socio-spatial levels, which manifest in translocal constellations of migrant households across space, produce either opportunities (e.g. additional income, gaining experience and knowledge, extending social networks) or impairment (e.g. exploitative and insecure low-pay jobs on the urban labor market not facilitating applicable skill-or knowledge gains) or both at the same time. Hence, by applying translocality to attend to the potentiality of migration through the lens of precarity and vice versa, adequate attention can be drawn to the so-called agents of change and their everyday lives from their own and from their family's perspective, revealing both adaptation-conducive and destabilizing impacts of migration. This integrated, multi-dimensional perspective contributes to a more realistic understanding of how, when, and why migration can or cannot enhance capacities to deal with risks and use opportunities in the context of climate change.

Acknowledgements

This article is based on research within the frame of the project "Buildung Resilience through Translocality: Climate Change, Migration and Social Resilience of Rural Communities in Thailand" (www.transre.org) funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), Germany ,grant number 01LN1309A. We thank the funding body for their support. The responsibility for the contents of this publication lies with the authors.

References

Adger, W.N., Huq, S., Brown, K., Conway, D., Hulme, M., 2003. Adaptation to climate change in the developing world. Prog. Dev. Stud. 3 (3), 179–195.
Agunias, D.R., Newland, K., 2007. Circular Migration and Development: Trends, Policy Routes, and Ways Forward. MPI Policy Brief, Washington.
Alberti, G., Holgate, J., Tapia, M., 2013. Organising migrants as workers or as migrant workers? Intersectionality, trade unions and precarious work. Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manage. 24 (22), 4132–4148.
Allen, W., Anderson, B., Van Hear, N., Sumption, M., Düvell, F., Hough, J., Rose, L., Humphris, R., Walker, S., 2018. Who counts in crises? The new geopolitics of international migration and refugee governance. Geopolitics 23 (1), 217–243.
Altenburg, F., Faustmann, A., Pfeffer, T., Skrivanek, I. (Eds.), 2017. Migration und Globalisierung in Zeiten des Umbruchs. Festschrift für Gudrun Biffl, Krems.
Amare, M., Hohfeld, L., Jitsuchon, S., Waibel, H., 2012. Rural-urban migration and employment quality: a case study from Thailand. Asian Dev. Rev. 29 (1), 57–79.
Anglewicz, P., Naumann, B., Van Landingham, M., Pattaravanich, U., 2005. The effect of rural to urban migration on social support in Thailand. https://cdn.uclouvain.be/public/Exports%20reddot/demo/documents/Anglewicz_Nauman_VanLandingham_Pattaravanich.pdf (Accessed 6/2/2018).
Anthias, F., 2002. Where do I belong? Narrating collective identity and translocational positionality. Ethnicities 2 (4), 491–514.
Anthias, F., 2012a. Intersectional what? Social divisions, intersectionality and levels of analysis. Ethnicities 13 (1), 3–19.
Anthias, F., 2012b. Hierarchies of social location, class and intersectionality: Towards a translocational frame. Int. Sociol. 28 (1), 121–138.
ADB, 2012. Addressing Climate Change and Migration in Asia and the Pacific. Asian Development Bank, Manila.
Arnold, D., Bongiovi, J.R., 2013. Precarious, informalizing, and flexible work: Transforming concepts and understandings. Am. Behav. Sci. 57, 289–308.
Askew, M., 2002. Bangkok, Place and Practice and Representation. Routledge, London, New York.
Ayudhya, S.C.N., 2010. The Thai Labour Movement: Strength through Unity. Challenges and Recommendations. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Policy Analysis Thailand. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Bangkok.
Baey, G., Yeoh, B.S.A., 2015. Migration and precarious work: Negotiating debt, employment, and livelihood strategies amongst Bangladeshi migrant men working in Singapore's construction industry. Migrating out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium Working Paper 26. University of Sussex. Falmer.
Banerjee, S., Black, R., Kniveton, D., 2012. Migration as an effective mode of adaptation to climate change. Report Submitted to the European Commission. Brussels.
Bastia, T., McGrath,S., 2011. Temporality, Migration and Unfree Labour: Migrant Garment Workers. Manchester Papers in Political Economy, no. 6, Manchester.
Beardsley, D.K., Hugo, G.J., 2010. Migration and climate change: Examining thresholds of change to guide effective adaptation decision-making. Popul. Environ. 32 (2–3), 238–262.
Bettini, G., Nash, S.L., Gioli, G., 2016. One step forward, two steps back? The fading contours of (in)justice in competing discourses on climate migration. Geographical J. 183 (4), 348–358.
Bettini, G., Gioli, G., 2015. Waltz with development: insights on the developmentalization of climate-induced migration. Migr. Develop. 5 (2), 171–189. https://doi.org/10.

1080/21632324.2015.1096143.
Black, R., Bennett, S.R.G., Thomas, S.M., Beddington, J.R., 2011. Climate change: Migration as adaptation. Nature 478 (7370), 447–449.
Bobić, M., Janković, B. (Eds.), 2017. Towards understanding of contemporary migration. Causes, Consequences, Policies, Reflections. Belgrade.
Bork-Hüffer, T., Etzold, B., Gransow, B., Tomba, L., Sterly, H., Suda, K., Kraas, F., Flock, R., 2016. Agency and the making of transient urban spaces: examples of migrants in the city in the Pearl River Delta, China, and Dhaka, Bangladesh. Population Space Place 22 (2), 128–145.
Brickell, K., Datta, A. (Eds.), 2011. Translocal Geographies – Spaces, Places, Connections. Ashgate, Farnham.
Calás, M.B., Ou, H., Smircich, L., 2013. Women on the move: Mobile subjectivities after intersectionality. Equality, Diversity Inclusion: An Int. J. 32 (8), 708–731.
Campbell, S., 2013. Solidarity formations under flexibilisation. workplace struggles of precarious Migrants in Thailand. Global Labour J. 4 (2), 134–151.
Charoenloet, V., 2002. Thailand and industrial restructuring: Government policies and the labor situation since 1997. J. Comp. Asian Dev. 1 (2), 245–261.
Charoenloet, V., 2015. Industrialization, globalization and labour force participation in Thailand. J. Asia Pacific Econ. 20 (1), 130–142.
Chouliaraki, L., Georgiou, M., Zaborowski, R., 2017. The European "Migration Crisis" and the Media: A Cross-European Press Content Analysis. The London School of Economics and Political Science, London.
Clausen, A., 2002. Female labour migration to bangkok: transforming rural-urban interactions and social networks through globalization. Asia Pacific Population J. 17 (3), 53–78.
Clemens, M., Özden, C., Rapoport, H., 2014. Migration and Development Research is Moving far Beyond Remittances. CGD Working Paper 365. Center for Global Development, Washington, DC.
Crawley, H., Skleparis, D., 2018. Refugees, migrants, neither, both: categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis'. J. Ethnic Migration Stud. 44 (1), 48–64.
Curran, S.R., Garip, F., Chung, C.Y., Tangchonlatip, K., 2005. Gendered migrant social capital: Evidence from Thailand. Soc. Forces 84 (1), 225–255. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2005.0094.
Datta, K., McIlwaine, C., Wills, J., Evans, Y., Herbert, J., May, J., 2007. The new development finance or exploiting migrant labour? Remittance sending among low-paid migrant workers in London. Int. Dev. Planning Rev. 29 (1), 43–67.
Deshingkar, P., 2012. Environmental risk, resilience and migration: Implications for natural resource management and agriculture. Environ. Res. Lett. 7 (1), 1–7.
Didero, M., 2011. Media images and everyday realities: German-Moroccan perspectives on translocational positionalities. In: Paper Presented at the International RC21 conference 2011, Amsterdam.
Dörre, K. 2006. Prekäre Arbeit und soziale Desintegration: zur subjektiven Verarbeitung unsicherer Beschäftigung. In: Rehberg, K.-S., Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie (DGS) (Ed.), Die Natur der Gesellschaft: Verhandlungen des 33. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Kassel, Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.
Erel, U., Ryan, L., 2018. Migrant capitals: proposing a multi-level spatio-temporal analytical framework. Sociology 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038518785298.
Etzold, B., 2016. Migration, informal labour and (trans)local productions of urban space – the case of Dhaka's street food vendors. Population, Space Place 22 (2), 170–184.
Faist, T., 2008. Migrants as transnational development agents: An inquiry into the newest round of the migration–development nexus. Population, Space Place 14 (1), 21–42.
Federici, S., 2006. Precarious Labor: A Feminist Viewpoint. Available at: http://inthemiddleofthewhirlwind.wordpress.com/precarious-labor-a-feminist-viewpoint/.
Fields, G.S., 1975. Rural-urban migration, urban unemployment and underemployment, and job-search activity in LDCs. J. Dev. Econ. 2 (2), 165–187.
Foresight (Ed.), 2011. Final Project Report – Foresight: Migration and Global Environmental Change. Government Office for Science, London.
Freitag, U., Von Oppen, A. (Eds.), 2010. Translocality. The Study of Globalizing Processes from a Southern Perspective. Brill Academic Publishers, Leiden, Boston.
Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) (Ed.), 2005. Migration in an interconnected world. New directions for action. Global Commission on International Migration, Geneva.
Greiner, C., Sakdapolrak, P., 2013. Translocality: Concepts, applications and emerging research perspectives. Geography Compass 7 (5), 373–384.
Guest, P., Richter, K., Chamratrithirong, A., Archavanitkul, K., Piriyathamwong, N., 1994. Internal migration in Thailand. Asian Pacific Migration J. 3 (4), 531–545.
Gulette, G.S., 2014. Rural-urban hierarchies, status boundaries, and labour mobilities in Thailand. J. Ethnic Migration Stud. 40 (8), 1254–1274.
De Haan, A., 1999. Livelihods and poverty: The role of migration – a critical review of the migration literature. J. Dev. Stud. 36 (2), 1–31.
De Haas, H., Van Rooij, A., 2010. Migration as emancipation? The impact of internal and international migration on the position of women left behind in rural Morocco. Oxford Dev. Stud. 38 (1), 43–62.
Harris, J.R., Todaro, M.P., 1970. Migration, unemployment and development: a two-sector analysis. Am. Econ. Rev. 60 (1), 126–142.
Hernandez, E., Coutin, S.B., 2006. Remitting subjects: migrants, money and states. Economy Soc. 35 (2), 185–208.
Herod, A., Lambert, R., 2016. Neoliberalism, precarious work and remaking the geography of globalcapitalism. In: Herod, A., Lambert, R. (Eds.), Neoliberal Capitalism and Precarious Work. Ethnographies of Accommodation and Resistance. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, Camberley, Northampton, Massachusetts.
Hewison, K., Tularak, W., 2013. Thailand and precarious work: an assessment. Am, Behav. Scientist 57 (4), 444–467.
Jaisat, K., Biel, E., Pollock, J., Press, B., 2014. Migrant Workers in Thailand's Garment Factories. Clean Clothes Campaign, Amsterdam.
Jampaklay, A., Korinek, K., Entwisle, B., 2007. Residential clustering among Nang Rong migrants in urban settings of Thailand. Asian Pacific Migration J. 16 (4), 485–510.
De Jong, G.F., 2000. Expectations, gender, and norms in migration decision-making. Population Studies 54 (3), 307–319.
Kalleberg, A.L., Hewison, K., 2013. Precarious Work and the Challenge for Asia. Am. Behav. Sci. 57 (3), 271–288.
Kapur, D., 2001. Diasporas and technology transfer. J. Hum. Dev. 2 (2), 265–286.
Kapur, D., 2005. Remittances: The new development mantra? In: Maimbo, S.M., Ratha, D. (Eds.), Remittances: Development Impact and Future Prospects. The World Bank, Washington, pp. 19–51.
Korinek, K., Entwisle, B., Jampaklay, A., 2005. Through thick and thin: layers of social ties and urban settlement among Thai migrants. Am. Sociol. Rev. 70 (5), 779–800.
Kraemer, K., Speidel, F., 2005. Prekarisierung von Erwerbsarbeit - Zur Transformation des arbeitsweltlichen Integrationsmodus. In: Heitmeyer, W., Imbusch, P. (Eds.), Integrationspotenziale einer modernen Gesellschaft. Analysen zu gesellschaftlicher Integration und Desintegration. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden, pp. 367–390.
Kunz, R., 2011. The Political Economy of Global Remittances: Gender, Governmentality and Neoliberalism. Routledge, London.
Kusznetsov, Y., Sabel, C.F., 2006. Work globally, develop locally: Diaspora networks as entry point to knowledge-based development. Innovation: Manage., Policy Practice 8 (1), 45–61.
Laczko, F., Aghazarm, C. (Eds.), 2009. Migration, Environment and Climate Change: Assessing the Evidence. International Organization for Migration, Geneva.
Le Mare, A., Promphaking, B., Rigg, J., 2015. Returning home: the middle-income trap and gendered norms in Thailand. J. Int. Dev. 27 (2), 285–306.
Lewis, H., Dwyer, P., Hodkinson, S., Waite, L., 2014. Hyperprecarious lives: Migrants, work and forced labor in the Global North. Prog. Hum. Geogr. 39 (5), 580–600.
Lindberg-Falk, M., 2010. Feminism, Buddhism and transnational women's movements in Thailand. In: Roces, M., Edwards, L. (Eds.), Women's Movements in Asia. Routledge, London, pp. 110–123.
Lindley, A., 2009. Remittances and conflict: Some conceptual considerations. J. Econ. Statistics (Jahrbuecher fuer Nationaloekonomie und Statistik) 229 (6), 774–786.
Lipton, M., 1980. Migration from rural areas of poor countries: The impact on rural productivity and income distribution. World Dev. 8 (1), 1–24.
Lutz, H., 2010. Gender in the migratory project. J. Ethnic Migration Stud. 36 (10), 1647–1663.
Manderscheid, K., 2009. Integrating space and mobilities into the analysis of social inequality. distinktion. J. Social Theory 10 (1), 7–27.
Massey, D.S., 1988. Economic development and international migration in comparative perspective. Population Dev. Rev. 14 (3), 383–413.
Massey, D.S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., Taylor, J.E., 1998. Worlds in Motion: International Migration at The End of The Millennium. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Mazzucato, V., Van Den Boom, B., Nsowah-Nuamah, N.N.N., 2008. Remittances in Ghana: Origin, destination, and issues of measurement. Int. Migration 46 (1), 103–122.
McDowell, L., 2008. Thinking through work: complex inequalities, constructions of difference and transnational migrants. Prog. Hum. Geogr. 32 (4), 491–507.
McLeman, R., Smit, B., 2006. Migration as an adaptation to climate change. Clim. Change 76 (1–2), 31–53.
Mills, M.B., 1999. Migrant labor takes a holiday. Reworking modernity and marginality in contemporary Thailand. Critique Anthropology 19 (1), 31–51.
Mills, M.B., 2003. Gender and inequality in the global labor force. Ann. Rev. Anthropology 32, 41–62.
Mills, M.B., 2012. Thai mobilities and cultural citizenship. Crit. Asian Stud. 44 (1), 85–112.
Munck, R., 2013. The precariat: A view from the South. Third World Quarterly 34 (5), 747–762.
Neilson, B., Rossiter, N., 2005. From precarity to precariousness and back again: labour, life and unstable networks. Fibrecult. J. 5 Available at: http://five.fibreculturejournal.org/fcj-022-from-precarity-to-precariousness-and-back-again-labour-life-and-unstable-networks/.
[dataset] NSO (National Statistical Office), 2008. Migration Survey 2008. Available at: http://service.nso.go.th/nso/nso_center/project/search_center/23project-en.htm.
[dataset] NSO (National Statistical Office), 2010. Labour Force Survey 2010. Available at: http://service.nso.go.th/nso/nso_center/project/search_center/23project-en.htm.
[dataset] NSO (National Statistical Office), 2012. Statistical Tables on Migration in Thailand. Available at: http://web.nso.go.th/en/survey/migrat/migrat.htm.
Niebuhr, A., 2010. Migration and innovation: Does cultural diversity matter for regional R &D activity? Pap. Regional Sci. 89 (3), 563–585.
International Migration 40 (5), 3–47.
Oberai, A.S., Singh, H.K.M., 1980. Migration, remittances and rural development: findings of a case study in the Indian Punjab. Int. Labour Rev. 119 (2), 229–241.
Orozco, M., Lowell, B.L., Bump, M., Fedewa, R., 2005. Transnational Engagement, Remittances and their Relationship to Development in Latin America and the Carribean. Georgetown University, Washington.
Osaki, K., 1999. Migrant remittances in Thailand: economic necessity or social norm? J. Population Res. 20 (2), 203–222.
Page, B., Mercer, C., 2012. Why do people do stuff? Reconceptualizing remittance behaviour in diaspora-development research and policy. Prog. Dev. Stud. 12 (1), 1–18.
Page, B., Plaza, S., 2006. Migration remittances and development: a review of global evidence. J. Afr. Econ. 15 (2,1), 245–336.
Paret, M., Gleeson, S., 2016. Precarity and agency through a migration lens. Citizsh. Stud. 20 (3–4), 277–294.
Parsons, L., 2016. Mobile inequality: Remittances and social network centrality in Cambodian migrant livelihoods. Migration Stud. 4 (2), 154–181.

Parsons, L., 2017. Multi-scalar inequality: Structured mobility and the narrative construction of scale in translocal Cambodia. Geoforum 85, 187–196.
Peck, J., Theodore, N. 2010. Labor markets from the bottom up. In: McGrath-Champ, S., Herod, A. and Rainnie, A. (Eds.), Handbook of employment and society: working space, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 87–105.
Pholphirul, P., 2012. Labour migration and the economic sustainability in Thailand. J. Curr. Southeast Asian Affairs 31 (3), 59–83.
Piguet, E., 2010. Linking climate change, environmental degradation, and migration: a methodological overview. WIREs Clim. Change 1 (4), 517–524.
Piper, N., 2008. Feminisation of migration and the social dimensions of development: the asian case. Third World Quarterly 29 (7), 1287–1303.
Piper, N., 2009. The complex interconnections of the migration-development nexus: A social perspective. Population, Space Place 15 (2), 93–101.
Platt, M., Baey, G., Yeoh, B.S.A., Khoo, C.Y., Lam, T., 2016. Debt precarity and gender: male and female temporary labour migrants in Singapore. J. Ethnic Migration Stud. 43 (1), 119–136.
Rahman, M.M., 2009. Temporary migration and changing family dynamics: Implications for social development. Population, Space Place 15 (2), 161–174.
Ransan-Cooper, H., 2016. The role of human agency in environmental change and mobility: A case study of environmental migration in Southeast Philippines. Environ. Sociol. 2 (2), 132–143.
Ratha, D., 2003. Workers" remittances: An important and stable source of development Finance. In: The World BankThe World Bank (Ed.), Global Development Finance 2003. The World Bank, Washington, pp. 157–175.
Rigg, J., 2014. Policies and negotiated everyday living: a view from the margins of development in Thailand and Vietnam. In: Elias, J., Rethel, L. (Eds.), The Everyday Political Economy of Southeast Asia. Cambridge University Press, pp. 27–48.
Rigg, J., Oven, K., 2015. Building liberal resilience? A critical review from developing rural Asia. Global Environ. Change 32, 175–186.
Rigg, J., Ritchie, M., 2002. Production, consumption and imagination in rural Thailand. J. Rural Stud. 18 (4), 359–371.
Rigg, J., Salamanca, A., Thompson, E.C., 2016. The puzzle of East and Southeast Asia's persistent smallholder. J. Rural Stud. 43, 118–133.
Saxenian, A., 2005. From brain drain to brain circulation: Transnational communities and regional upgrading in India and China. Stud. Comp. Int. Dev. 40 (2), 35–61.
Schade, J., Faist, T., McLeman, R., 2016. Conclusion: inequality and migration as adaptation - where do we go from here? In: McLeman, R., Schade, J., Faist, T. (Eds.), Environmental Migration and Social Inequality. Springer, Heidelberg, pp. 203–234.
Scheffran, J., Marmer, E., Sow, P., 2012. Migration as a contribution to resilience and innovation in climate adaptation: Social networks and co-development in Northwest Africa. Appl. Geogr. 33, 119–127.
Schierup, C.-U., Jørgensen, M.B., 2016. From 'social exclusion' to 'precarity'. The becoming-migrant of labour: an introduction. In: Schierup, C.-U., Jørgensen, M.B. (Eds.), Politics of Precarity: Migrant Conditions, Struggles and Experiences. Leiden, Brill, pp. 1–29.
Shain, Y., 1999. Marketing the American Creed Abroad: Diasporas in the US and their Homelands. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Siegmann, K.A., Schiphorst, F., 2016. Understanding the globalizing precariat: From informal sector to precarious work. Prog. in Develop. Stud. 16 (2), 1–13.
Sikder, M.J.U., Higgins, V., 2016. Remittances and social resilience of migrant households in rural Bangladesh. Migration Dev. 6 (2), 253–275.
Skeldon, R., 1997. Migration and Development: A Global Interpretation. Longman, London.
Standing, G., 2011. The Precariat. The New Dangerous Class. Bloomsbury Academic, New York.
Sterly, H., 2015. "Without a mobile phone, i suppose i had to go there" - mobile communication and translocal social constellations in Bangladesh. Asien (The German J. Contemporary Asia) 134, 31–46.
Strauss, K., Fudge, J., 2013. Temporary work, agencies and unfree labour: insecurity in the new world of work. In: Strauss, K., Fudge, J. (Eds.), Temporary Work, Agencies and Unfree Labour: Insecurity in the New World of Work. Routledge, New York, pp. 1–25.
Strauss, K., McGrath, S., 2017. Temporary migration precarious employment and unfree labour relations. Exploring the 'continuum of exploitation' in Canada's temporary foreign worker program. Geoforum 78, 199–208.
Taylor, E.J., 1999. The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. Int. Migration 37 (1), 63–88.
Thieme, S., Siegmann, K., 2010. Coping on women's backs. Social capital-vulnerability links through a gender lens. Curr. Sociol. 58 (5), 715–737.
UN General Assembly (Ed.), 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 21 October 2015, A/RES/70/1. Available at: http://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html.
UNDESA (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs) (Ed.), 2017. Global context for achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. International financial flows and external debt. Development Issues No. 10, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York.
Vanwey, L.K., 2004. Altruistic and contractual remittances between male and female migrants and households in rural Thailand. Demography 41 (4), 739–756.
Vorng, S., 2011. Beyond the urban-rural divide: complexities of class status and hierarchy in Bangkok. Asian J. Social Sci. 39 (5), 674–701.
Vosko, L.F., 2006. Precarious Employment: Understanding Labour Market Insecurity in Canada. McGill-Queen's Press.
Waite, L., 2009. A place and space for a critical geography of precarity? Geography Compass 3 (1), 412–433.
Waite, L., Lewis, H., Dwyer, P., Hodkinson, S., 2015. Precarious lives: refugees and asylum seekers' resistance within unfree labouring. ACME: Int. E-J. Crit. Geographies 14 (2), 479–491.
Warner, K., Afifi, T., 2014. Where the rain falls: Evidence from 8 countries on how vulnerable households use migration to manage the risk of rainfall variability and food insecurity. Climate Dev. 6 (1), 1–17.
Westerheide, J.E., 2015. Prekäre Frauenerwerbstätigkeit im globalen Süden – Zur Übertragbarkeit der Prekarisierungsdebatte. Social Transformations. Res. Precarisation Diversity – Int. Interdisciplinary J. 1 (1) [online article].
Wills, J., Datta, K., Evans, Y., Herbert, J., May, J., McIlwaine, C., 2009. Global Cities at Work: New Migrant Divisions of Labour. Pluto Press, London.
Wilson, S., Ebert, N., 2013. Precarious work: Economic, sociological and political perspectives. Econ. Labour Relations Rev. 24 (3), 263–278.
Wong, M., 2006. The gendered politics of remittances in Ghanaian transnational families. Econ. Geography 82 (4), 355–381.
World Bank, 2007. Migration and Remittances: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. The World Bank, Washington.
[dataset] World Bank, 2014. DataBank. World Development Indicators. Available at: http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=2&country=THA.
World Bank, 2016. Migration and Remittances Factbook 2016, third ed. The World Bank, Washington.